



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ment, which contrasts remarkably with the usual pungency of the prophet's style."

The Tyre section.: This is mentioned last because it is least clear. Suspicion has attached itself to (1) the fact that Tyre alone is mentioned, the other cities being passed over (*cf.* on the other hand, Gaza, Ekron and Ashkelon in the case of Philistia); (2) the similarity of thought and language in the judgment upon Gaza; (3) the absence of the usual formula; (4) the similarity in form to that of Edom and Judah. The answer of George Adam Smith⁵ is not satisfactory.

If these considerations are valid, we find that one strophic construction prevails in the original material and quite a different one in the later addition. Here *form* confirms the suspicions which had already been aroused as to the authenticity.

In conclusion : (1) Whether the seven sections or only four of the seven are treated as authentic, the evident purpose of the author (or authors) is to put the material in poetic form, and in the treatment of each section to use essentially the same form, and, so far as possible, the same words. (2) This being true, we are warranted in supposing that radical variations, for which no other explanation may be offered, and in which the entire symmetry of the piece is destroyed, are the result of textual corruption, or editorial change. (3) If in the piece as a whole, two entirely different strophic types appear, we must suppose that this is due either (*a*) to the desire of the author for mere variety, or (*b*) to a distinct purpose in connection with the thought of the piece, or (*c*) to the fact that it is the work of a different author. The last explanation would have force only if strengthened by other considerations.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

WILLIAM R. HARPER.

PETER'S SOJOURN IN ROME.

IT is not my intention in this brief note to discuss the fact of Peter's presence in Rome. That he found his way thither in the latter part of his life, and met his death there, is now so generally recognized among scholars that it would be gratuitous to argue the matter. But though the fact itself may be regarded as established, the date of the apostle's arrival in Rome and the length of his stay there demand, it seems to me, renewed investigation.

The prevalent opinion is that he did not reach Rome until after the close of Paul's two years' imprisonment, which is commonly put

⁵ *The Twelve Prophets*, Vol. I, p. 128.

into the year 63 or 64, and that he died in the persecution of Nero, which occurred in the summer or fall of 64. This leaves at most but a single year for his residence in the city. But it must be confessed that it is very difficult, if he was there so short a time, to account for the early and widespread tradition that he was bishop of the church of Rome for many years; and still more difficult to explain the fact that in the memory of that church his figure overshadowed Paul's from an early day. Dogmatic considerations undoubtedly had much to do with the growth of Peter's reputation and authority, but dogmatic considerations alone do not account for it. Long before the Christian world had assigned him an official preëminence in the apostolic college, he was honored as the founder of the Roman church, and it must be evident to every careful student of primitive Christianity that the subsequent history of that church remains a mystery unless some commanding figure, animated with the conciliatory and practical spirit which we know Peter possessed, and representing quite another than the Pauline type of Christianity, made his influence powerfully felt in its early development. But the condition of things in Rome, as depicted in Paul's epistle to the Philippians, was hardly such as to make it possible for Peter or anyone else to gather together the various discordant elements and start the church upon that consistent and confident career which was already well under way before the close of the first century, unless he spent a long time in the city. A few months or a year would not have been sufficient to give him that controlling and permanent influence which both history and tradition seem to presuppose. Under these circumstances it is worth asking whether the opinion as to the duration of his Roman sojourn, commonly shared at least by Protestant scholars, will not bear revision.

That Peter suffered martyrdom is too well attested to admit of doubt (*cf.* John 20:21, Clement, *ad Cor.*, 5 f.); and though it cannot be certainly proved that he met his death in the great persecution of 64, it is altogether probable that he did. It was the common belief of the church, at any rate, from the second century on, that he suffered under Nero, and it may be seriously doubted whether, after the outbreak in 64, Nero in any way concerned himself with the Christians during the remainder of his reign. The connection in which Peter's martyrdom is mentioned by Clement of Rome may also be taken as an indication that he died either in the great persecution or before it; and the tradition that he was crucified (Tertullian, *De præscr. Haer.*,

36) and the statement of Caius of Rome (quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.*, II, 25) that he was buried in the Vatican, which was the scene of the butchery, both go to confirm the assumption that he was one of its victims. Though it is possible, therefore, to suppose with Professor Ramsay that he lived until a later time (*Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 282, f.) it is by no means easy to do so.

On the other hand it may be regarded as absolutely certain, in the light of the situation in the Roman church presupposed in Romans, Philippians, and 2 Timothy, that Peter did not come to Rome before or during Paul's imprisonment there. The question then is, if he suffered martyrdom in 64 and did not reach Rome until after the close of Paul's imprisonment, can his sojourn in the city be made of sufficient length to satisfy the conditions referred to above? Or, in other words, can Paul's imprisonment be put some years earlier than commonly supposed?

It is well known that the date of Paul's imprisonment depends upon the date of the accession of Festus as procurator of Judea, for almost immediately thereafter Paul left Cæsarea for Rome, where he arrived in the following spring. The accession of Festus is commonly put into the year 60. Schürer, who accepts that date, closes his careful discussion of the subject with the words: "Am correctesten ist es, mit Wurm zu sagen: frühestens 58, spätestens 61, wahrscheinlich 60." But there is good ground, it seems to me, for cutting loose from the prevailing opinion, thus expressed, and for pushing the date of Festus' accession back to the year 55. Josephus records that Festus' predecessor, Felix, was accused before Nero by prominent Jews of Cæsarea, and that he escaped punishment only because of the influence of his brother Pallas, who at that time enjoyed especial favor with the emperor (*Ant. XX*, 8, 9). But Tacitus reports that Pallas fell into disfavor with Nero and was relieved of his offices before the end of the year 55 (*Ann. XIII*, 14), and the historian's account of Nero's attitude toward Pallas, and his silence touching any reconciliation between them, to say nothing of the emperor's treatment of Agrippina, with whose fortunes those of Pallas were so intimately bound up, make it very difficult to believe that the latter again acquired influence at court. That Pallas was acquitted of the crime of conspiracy a few months after his dismissal from office (Tacitus, *Ann. XIII*, 23) cannot be urged as a proof that he subsequently enjoyed Nero's favor, for he had expressly stipulated at the time of his dismissal that he should not be questioned for any part of his past conduct (*Ann. XIII*, 14), and Tacitus remarks

that his "acquittal was not so gratifying [evidently meaning to the emperor] as his arrogance was offensive" (XIII, 23).

But the accusation from which Felix was relieved by the good offices of his brother was made after his departure from Palestine and after the accession of his successor, Festus (*Ant.* XX, 8, 9). It seems, therefore, that the latter must have become procurator in 55, for before the end of that year Pallas was in disgrace, while Nero ascended the throne too late in the previous year (October 13) to send Festus to Palestine before the early fall, when Paul was dispatched to Rome (*cf.* *Acts* 27:9).

Against this opinion no valid objections can be urged. The fact that most of the deeds ascribed to Felix by Josephus are related in connection with the reign of Nero (*Ant.* XX, 8; *B. J.* II, 13) has no significance, for, all told, they are very few, and of the same general character, and may easily have been accomplished within a few months or even weeks. Nor do the words addressed by Paul to Felix two years before the close of the latter's term of office ("Forasmuch as I know that thou hast been for many years a judge unto this nation," *Acts* 24:10), prove anything. For even though Cumanus may not have been succeeded by Felix until 52, as Tacitus and Josephus seem to imply (*Ann.* XII, 54; *Ant.* XX, 7, 1), Tacitus expressly says in *Ann.* XII, 54 that Felix had already been for a long time (*jam pridem*) governor of Judea, including Samaria, while Cumanus was governor of Galilee. Josephus, to be sure, says nothing of such a division of the province, but his account at this point is so improbable in many of its features and contains so many palpable inaccuracies that we can hardly hesitate to follow Mommsen in preferring the authority of Tacitus to that of Josephus (so also Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, p. 313). Paul's words, therefore, might have been uttered in 53, when, if the view presented in this paper be correct, he was taken a prisoner to Cæsarea, as well as in 58 or any other year. No objection to the view here maintained can be deduced from the chronology of Paul's life, for if the period between his conversion and his second visit to Jerusalem (*Gal.* 2 and *Acts* 15) be made fourteen instead of seventeen years there is no difficulty in putting that visit, with the Apostolic Council, five years earlier than the date commonly adopted.

But if Festus became procurator in the year 55, as I have endeavored to prove, Paul must have arrived in Rome in the spring of 56, and his death, with which his two years' imprisonment closed, must have occurred in 58. It is quite possible, then, to suppose that Peter

came to Rome very soon thereafter, and spent six full years in the city. A stay of that length is abundant to satisfy all the conditions referred to in the beginning of this paper.

The earlier date for Festus' accession adopted in this note has been maintained also by Kellner in the *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 1888, p. 630 f. (and in other articles according to Schürer), also, according to Schürer, by Weber, in his *Kritische Geschichte der Exegese des 9ten Kapitels des Römerbriefes*, 1889 (a work I have not seen), and more recently (1895) by O. Holtzmann, in his *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, p. 128 f.; but, so far as I am aware, no one has deduced from it the conclusion that Peter may have come to Rome some years earlier than ordinarily supposed, and that, therefore, even though he perished in the persecution of Nero, he may have spent a long enough time there to influence permanently the development of the Roman church. That this consideration in turn lends confirmation to the proposed revision of the accepted chronology of Paul's later years will hardly be denied.

ARTHUR C. MCGIFFERT.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
New York.

ST. PAUL'S USE OF δικαιοῦν.

THE meaning of δικαιοῦν in the epistles of St. Paul is a matter about which biblical scholars have come to a general agreement. And it seems therefore a rather bold matter for anyone to reopen the question. And I should not do so if there had not seemed to be a curious kind of iteration in the recent treatment of the subject, indicating that the conclusions had been reached without any particular independence or freshness of investigation, as if later students had stood in awe of such concurrent opinion. The main points in this traditional view are, first, that the verb does not mean to make righteous, probably never means that, even in other writings; secondly, that in St. Paul's epistles it does mean to judge righteous; and, thirdly, that in the case of believers this judgment is not on the ground of their righteousness, but solely for reasons outside themselves. On the contrary, I affirm with but little hesitation that it is simply impossible to carry the meaning, *to judge righteous*, through St. Paul's writings with any attention to grammar or context; that there are whole classes of passages in which a rational exegesis makes this use absurd; secondly, that the discarded sense, to make righteous, is the very fundamental meaning